

DYNAMICS OF A STOCHASTIC RATIO-DEPENDENT PREDATOR-PREY MODEL

NGUYEN THI HOAI LINH, TA VIET TON*

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider a stochastic ratio-dependent predator-prey model. We firstly prove the existence, uniqueness and positivity of the solutions. Then, the boundedness of moments of population are studied. Finally, we show the upper-growth rates and exponential death rates of population under some conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The stable predator-prey Lotka-Volterra equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_t = (a_1 - c_1 y_t - b_1 x_t)x_t, \\ \dot{y}_t = (-a_2 + c_2 x_t - b_2 y_t)y_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

has attracted much interest. In this model, x_t and y_t represent the population density of prey species and predator species at time t , respectively; a_1 is the intrinsic growth rate of prey in the absence of predator, a_2 is the death rate of predator in the absence of prey; b_i measures the inhibiting effect of environment on two species; c_i ($i = 1, 2$) are coefficients of the effect of a species on the other and those coefficients are positive constants. It is well-known that the solution of (1.1) is asymptotically stable.

For the stochastic predator-prey Lotka-Volterra equation, we have to mention one of the first attempts in this direction, a very interesting paper of Arnold et al. [2] where the authors used the theory of Brownian motion and the related white noise models to study the sample paths of the equation

$$\begin{cases} dx_t = (a_1 - c_1 y_t - b_1 x_t)x_t dt + \sigma x_t dw_t, \\ dy_t = (-a_2 + c_2 x_t - b_2 y_t)y_t dt + \rho y_t dw_t, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $\{w_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a 1-dimensional Brownian motion defined on a complete probability space with filtration $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ satisfying the usual conditions (see [5]). The positive numbers σ, ρ , respectively, are the coefficients of the effect of environmental stochastic perturbation on the prey and on the predator population. In this model, the random factor makes influences on the intrinsic growth rates of prey and predator.

For both models (1.1) and (1.2), the predator consumes the prey with functional response of type $c_1 x_t y_t$ and contributes to its growth rate $c_2 x_t y_t$. For such models,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 92D25, 37H10.

Key words and phrases. Predator-prey model; Ratio-dependent functional response; Stochastic differential equation; Moment boundedness; Asymptotic behaviour.

* Corresponding author.

we refer to [7, 8]. However, some biologists have argued that in many situations, especially when predators have to search for food, the functional response should depend on both prey's and predator's densities; for example, a Holling's type II functional response in a type of $\frac{x_t y_t}{\alpha + \beta x_t}$ [9, 10], a ratio-dependent one in a type of $\frac{x_t y_t}{x_t + \gamma y_t}$ [3]. The model in those papers are deterministic.

In this paper, we consider a ratio-dependent predator-prey model in the random environment in which the white noise makes the effect on both the growth rates of species and the inhibiting effects of environment on two species, i.e., $a_1 \rightarrow a_1 + \sigma_1 \dot{w}_t$, $-a_2 \rightarrow -a_2 + \rho_1 \dot{w}_t$, $-b_1 \rightarrow -b_1 + \sigma_1 \dot{w}_t$, $-b_2 \rightarrow -b_2 + \rho_2 \dot{w}_t$. The model is as follows

$$\begin{cases} dx_t = \left[a_1(t) - b_1(t)x_t - \frac{c_1(t)y_t}{x_t + e(t)y_t} \right] x_t dt \\ \quad + [\sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t)x_t] x_t dw_t, \\ dy_t = \left[-a_2(t) - b_2(t)y_t + \frac{c_2(t)x_t}{x_t + e(t)y_t} \right] y_t dt \\ \quad + [\rho_1(t) + \rho_2(t)y_t] y_t dw_t. \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

The white noise here is effected by one-dimensional Brownian motion $\{w_t, t \geq 0\}$ defined on the complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions. Throughout this paper, we suppose that all coefficients of deterministic part of (1.3) are bounded by some positive constants, i.e., their infimum and supremum on $t \geq 0$ are positive, and assume that σ_i, ρ_i ($i = 1, 2$) are nonnegative bounded functions.

The first aim of this paper is to study the existence, uniqueness and positivity of solutions of system (1.3) by using some Lyapunov functions. The next aim is investigating the boundedness of moments. And the final one is to show some upper-growth rates as well as showing the exponential death rates of species under some conditions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove the existence, uniqueness and positivity of solutions. Section 3 produces asymptotic estimations of moments. In section 4, the upper-growth rates and exponential death rates of species are studied.

2. GLOBAL SOLUTION

In this section, we show that the solution of system (1.3) is positive and global. Denote $\mathbb{R}_+^n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i > 0 (i \geq 1)\}$, $\mathbb{R}_{+0}^n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i \geq 0 (i \geq 1)\}$ ($n = 1, 2$). Let $g(t)$ be a function, for a brevity, instead of writing $g(t)$ we write g . If g is bounded continuous function on \mathbb{R}_{+0} , we denote

$$g^u = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{+0}} g(t), \quad g^l = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{+0}} g(t).$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *For any given initial value $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, there is a unique solution (x_t, y_t) to (1.3) for $t \geq 0$. Further, with probability one, \mathbb{R}_+^2 is positively invariant for (1.3), i.e., $(x_t, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ a.s. for all $t \geq 0$, if $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.*

Proof. Since some coefficients of (1.3) are not locally Lipschitz continuous, we can not say that there is a unique local solution (x_t, y_t) to (1.3). However, we consider

the following system

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_t = \left[a_1 - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \exp\{\xi_t\})^2 - b_1 \exp\{\xi_t\} - \frac{c_1 \exp\{\eta_t\}}{\exp\{\xi_t\} + e \exp\{\eta_t\}} \right] dt \\ \quad + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \exp\{\xi_t\}) dw_t, \\ d\eta_t = \left[-a_2 - \frac{1}{2}(\rho_1 + \rho_2 \exp\{\eta_t\})^2 - b_2 \exp\{\eta_t\} + \frac{c_2 \exp\{\xi_t\}}{\exp\{\xi_t\} + e \exp\{\eta_t\}} \right] dt \\ \quad + (\rho_1 + \rho_2 \exp\{\eta_t\}) dw_t, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

with an initial value $(\xi_0, \eta_0) = (\ln x_0, \ln y_0)$. Since the coefficients of (2.1) are locally Lipschitz continuous, there is a unique local solution (ξ_t, η_t) to (2.1) for $t \in [0, \tau)$, where τ is the explosion time (Arnold [1] or Friedman [4]). Therefore, by Itô's formula, $(x_t, y_t) = (\exp\{\xi_t\}, \exp\{\eta_t\})$ is the unique positive local solution to (1.3) for $t \in [0, \tau)$ with the initial value (x_0, y_0) . To show the solution is global, we need to show that $\tau = \infty$ a.s. We use the technique of localization dealt with in [5, 6]. Let $k_0 > 0$ be sufficiently large for x_0 and y_0 lying within the interval $[\frac{1}{k_0}, k_0]$. Let us define a sequence of stopping times [5, Problem 2.7, p.7] for each integer $k \geq k_0$ by

$$\tau_k = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : x_t \notin \left(\frac{1}{k}, k \right) \text{ or } y_t \notin \left(\frac{1}{k}, k \right) \right\}$$

(with the convention $\inf \emptyset = \infty$). Since τ_k is nondecreasing as $k \rightarrow \infty$, there exists the limit $\tau_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k$. Then $\tau_\infty \leq \tau$ a.s. Now, we will show that $\tau_\infty = \infty$ a.s. If this statement is false, then there exist $T > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_\infty \leq T\} > \varepsilon$. Thus, by denoting $\Omega_k = \{\tau_k \leq T\}$, there exists $k_1 \geq k_0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_k) \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } k \geq k_1. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $\theta_i \in (0, 1)$ ($i = 1, 2$). We consider the following function

$$V(x, y) = x^{\theta_1} - \ln x + y^{\theta_2} - \ln y - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i}.$$

Because $x^{\theta_1} - \ln x - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_1}{\theta_1} \geq 0$ for all $x > 0$, we have $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R}_{+0})$. If $(x_t, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, by using Itô's formula, we get

$$dV(x_t, y_t) = f(x_t, y_t, t) dt + g(x_t, y_t, t) dw_t, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, y, t) &= (\theta_1 x^{\theta_1} - 1)(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x) + (\theta_2 y^{\theta_2} - 1)(\rho_1 + \rho_2 y), \\ f(x, y, t) &= (\theta_1 x^{\theta_1} - 1) \left[a_1 - b_1 x - \frac{c_1 y}{x + ey} \right] \\ &\quad + (\theta_2 y^{\theta_2} - 1) \left[-a_2 - b_2 y - \frac{c_2 x}{x + ey} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} [\theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1) x^{\theta_1} + 1] (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} [\theta_2 (\theta_2 - 1) y^{\theta_2} + 1] (\rho_1 + \rho_2 y)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

It is easy to see from $\theta_i \in (0, 1)$ and from (2.4) that the function $f(x, y, t)$ is bounded above, say by M , in $\mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{+0}$. It then follows from $(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and from

(2.3) that

$$\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_k} dV(x_t, y_t) \leq \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_k} M dt + \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_k} g(x_t, y_t, t) dw_t.$$

Taking expectations yields

$$\mathbb{E}V(x_{T \wedge \tau_k}, y_{T \wedge \tau_k}) \leq V(x_0, y_0) + M\mathbb{E}(T \wedge \tau_k) \leq V(x_0, y_0) + MT. \quad (2.5)$$

On the other hand, for every $\omega \in \Omega_k$, either $x_{\tau_k}(\omega)$ or $y_{\tau_k}(\omega)$ belongs to the set $\{k, \frac{1}{k}\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} V(x_{T \wedge \tau_k}(\omega), y_{T \wedge \tau_k}(\omega)) &\geq \min \left\{ k^{\theta_i} - \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{k^{\theta_i}} - \ln \frac{1}{k} - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i} \quad (i = 1, 2) \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ k^{\theta_i} - \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{k^{\theta_i}} + \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i} \quad (i = 1, 2) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore get from (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}V(x_{T \wedge \tau_k}, y_{T \wedge \tau_k}) &\geq \mathbb{E}[1_{\Omega_k} V(x_{T \wedge \tau_k}, y_{T \wedge \tau_k})] \\ &\geq \varepsilon \min \left\{ k^{\theta_i} - \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{k^{\theta_i}} + \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i} \quad (i = 1, 2) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from (2.5) that

$$V(x_0, y_0) + MT \geq \varepsilon \min \left\{ k^{\theta_i} - \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i}, \frac{1}{k^{\theta_i}} + \ln k - \frac{1 + \ln \theta_i}{\theta_i} \quad (i = 1, 2) \right\}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ leads to $\infty > V(x_0, y_0) + MT = \infty$. This is a contradiction. Therefore $\tau_\infty = \infty$ a.s. Then $\tau = \infty$ a.s., and $(x_t, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ a.s. The proof is complete. \square

3. BOUNDEDNESS OF MOMENTS

In this section, we shall show the boundedness of species's quantity moments. In order to capture them, we shall distinguish between the following hypotheses of random perturbation.

(H1) The random factor make only effects on the growth rate of population, i.e., $\sigma_2(t) = \rho_2(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $\sigma_1^l, \rho_1^l > 0$;

(H2) The random factor make effects on both the growth rate of population and the inhibiting effects of environment, i.e., $\sigma_i^l, \rho_i^l > 0$ ($i = 1, 2$).

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} LV(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2}[\sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t)x]^2 x^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{1}{2}[\rho_1(t) + \rho_2(t)y]^2 y^2 \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} \\ &\quad + [\sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t)x][\rho_1(t) + \rho_2(t)y]xy \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x \partial y} \\ &\quad + f_1(x, y, t) \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + f_2(x, y, t) \frac{\partial V}{\partial y}, \end{aligned}$$

the infinitesimal operator of (1.3), defined on the space $C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x, y, t) &= a_1x - \frac{c_1xy}{x + ey} - b_1x^2, \\ f_2(x, y, t) &= -a_2y + \frac{c_2xy}{x + ey} - b_2y^2, \end{aligned}$$

and for any positive numbers θ_1, θ_2 , we put

$$\begin{aligned} d_2 &= \min\{\theta_i b_i^l \ (i = 1, 2)\}, \quad \theta = \frac{1}{\theta_1 + \theta_2}, \\ d_1 &= \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1^2(t) \theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_1^2(t) \theta_2 (\theta_2 - 1) + \sigma_1(t) \rho_1(t) \theta_1 \theta_2 + \theta_1 a_1(t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [c_2(t) - a_2(t)] \theta_2 \right\}, \\ \lambda_1 &= \frac{d_1}{d_2} - (\theta_1 + \theta_2) \{1 - \ln(\theta_1 + \theta_2)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

$$\lambda_2(x_0, y_0) = (\theta_1 \ln x_0 + \theta_2 \ln y_0) + (\theta_1 + \theta_2) \{1 - \ln(\theta_1 + \theta_2)\} - \frac{d_1}{d_2}.$$

We have the following theorems.

Theorem 3.1. *Under condition (H1), for any positive θ_1, θ_2 and initial value $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, solution of (1.3) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}(x_t^{\theta_1} y_t^{\theta_2}) \leq \exp\{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2(x_0, y_0) \exp\{-d_2 t\}\} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Consequently, $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(x_t^{\theta_1} y_t^{\theta_2}) \leq \exp\{\lambda_1\}$.

Proof. Firstly, we prove that

$$\mathbb{E}(x_t^{\theta_1} y_t^{\theta_2}) < \infty \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } \theta_i > 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Define a function $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+^2, \mathbb{R}_+)$ by $V(x, y) = x^{\theta_1} y^{\theta_2}$. For any $t \geq 0$, using Itô's formula gives that

$$dV(x_t, y_t) = LV(x_t, y_t)dt + (\theta_1 \sigma_1 + \theta_2 \rho_1)V(x_t, y_t)dw_t. \tag{3.3}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} LV(x, y) &= \left[\frac{1}{2} \theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1) \sigma_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 (\theta_2 - 1) \rho_1^2 + \theta_1 \theta_2 \sigma_1 \rho_1 + \theta_1 (a_1 - b_1 x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \theta_2 (a_2 + b_2 y) + \frac{\theta_2 c_2 x - \theta_1 c_1 y}{x + ey} \right] V(x, y) \\ &\leq [d_1 - d_2(x + y)]V(x, y). \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

For every integer $k \geq 1$, we define a stopping time $\tau_k = \inf\{t \geq 0 : x_t + y_t \geq k\}$. Then, the sequence $\{\tau_k, k \geq 1\}$ is nondecreasing and by the positive invariance of (x_t, y_t) on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tau_k = \infty$ a.s. It then follows from (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} V(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k}) &= V(x_0, y_0) + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} LV(x_s, y_s) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} [\theta_1 \sigma_1(s) + \theta_2 \rho_1(s)] V(x_s, y_s) dw_s. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations of both sides and using (3.4), we have

$$\mathbb{E}V(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k}) \leq V(x_0, y_0) + d_1 \mathbb{E} \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} V(x_s, y_s) ds$$

$$\leq V(x_0, y_0) + d_1 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}V(x_{s \wedge \tau_k}, y_{s \wedge \tau_k}) ds.$$

Thus, by using Gronwall's inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}V(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k}) \leq V(x_0, y_0) \exp\{d_1 t\}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the latter inequality, we yield that, for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}V(x_t, y_t) \leq V(x_0, y_0) \exp\{d_1 t\}$, from which we deduce (3.2).

Next, since $V(x, y) = x^{\theta_1} y^{\theta_2} \leq (x + y)^{\theta_1 + \theta_2}$, we have $x + y \geq V^\theta(x, y)$. It then follows from (3.4) that

$$LV(x, y) \leq [d_1 - d_2 V^\theta(x, y)]V(x, y). \quad (3.5)$$

Applying (3.2) to $(\theta_1(1 + \theta), \theta_2(1 + \theta))$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V^{1+\theta}(x_t, y_t)] = \mathbb{E}\left[x_t^{\theta_1(1+\theta)} y_t^{\theta_2(1+\theta)}\right] < \infty \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Then, by using Hölder's inequality, yields

$$[\mathbb{E}V(x_t, y_t)]^{1+\theta} \leq \mathbb{E}[V^{1+\theta}(x_t, y_t)].$$

It then follows from (3.3) and from (3.5) that, for any $t \geq 0$ and $h > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}V(x_{t+h}, y_{t+h}) - \mathbb{E}V(x_t, y_t) &\leq \int_t^{t+h} [d_1 \mathbb{E}V(x_s, y_s) - d_2 \mathbb{E}V^{1+\theta}(x_s, y_s)] ds \\ &\leq \int_t^{t+h} [d_1 \mathbb{E}V(x_s, y_s) - d_2 [\mathbb{E}V(x_s, y_s)]^{1+\theta}] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Putting $v(t) = \mathbb{E}V(x_t, y_t)$, then $0 < v(t) < \infty$ for all $t \geq 0$. Further, the continuity of $v(t)$ in t can be seen by the continuity of the solution (x_t, y_t) and the dominated convergence theorem. We define the right upper derivative of $v(t)$ by

$$D^+v(t) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{v(t+h) - v(t)}{h}.$$

From (3.6), we have

$$\frac{v(t+h) - v(t)}{h} \leq \frac{1}{h} \int_t^{t+h} [d_1 v(s) - d_2 v^{1+\theta}(s)] ds.$$

Letting $h \rightarrow 0$ gives $D^+v(t) \leq v(t)[d_1 - d_2 v^\theta(t)]$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D^+[\exp\{d_2 t\} \ln v(t)] &= d_2 \exp\{d_2 t\} \ln v(t) + \exp\{d_2 t\} \frac{D^+v(t)}{v(t)} \\ &\leq d_2 \exp\{d_2 t\} \ln v(t) + \exp\{d_2 t\} [d_1 - d_2 v^\theta(t)] \\ &= d_1 \exp\{d_2 t\} + d_2 \exp\{d_2 t\} [\ln v(t) - v^\theta(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\ln x - x^\theta \leq -\frac{1}{\theta}(1 + \ln \theta)$ for all $x > 0$. Then

$$D^+[\exp\{d_2 t\} \ln v(t)] \leq \left[d_1 - \frac{1}{\theta}(1 + \ln \theta) d_2 \right] \exp\{d_2 t\}.$$

Taking integrations of both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{d_2 t\} \ln v(t) &\leq \ln v(0) + \left[\frac{d_1}{d_2} - \frac{1}{\theta}(1 + \ln \theta) \right] [\exp\{d_2 t\} - 1] \\ &= \lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \exp\{d_2 t\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have $\ln v(t) \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \exp\{-d_2 t\}$, from which follows the first statement of theorem. Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the latter inequality, we get the second one. The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Under condition (H2), for any $\theta_i \in (0, 1]$, $\varrho_i \in [0, 3)$ and $\varsigma_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exist positive constants $K_1 = K_1(\theta_i, \varsigma_i)$ and $K_2 = K_2(\varrho_i, \varsigma_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$) satisfying the following for any initial value $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$*

- (i) $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\varsigma_1 x_t^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_t^{\theta_2}] \leq K_1$;
- (ii) $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [\varsigma_1 x_s^{\varrho_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\varrho_2}] ds \leq K_2$.

Proof. Consider a function $V_1 : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^2$ defined by $V_1(x, y) = \varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}$. For any $t \geq 0$, by using Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dV_1(x_t, y_t) = & LV_1(x_t, y_t)dt + \left\{ \theta_1 \varsigma_1 [\sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t)x_t] x_t^{\theta_1} \right. \\ & \left. + \theta_2 \varsigma_2 [\rho_1(t) + \rho_2(t)y_t] y_t^{\theta_2} \right\} dw_t, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} LV_1(x, y) = & \frac{1}{2} \theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1) \varsigma_1 [\sigma_1(t) + \sigma_2(t)x]^2 x^{\theta_1} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \theta_2 (\theta_2 - 1) \varsigma_2 [\rho_1(t) + \rho_2(t)y]^2 y^{\theta_2} \\ & + \theta_1 \varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} \left[a_1(t) - b_1(t)x - \frac{c_1(t)y}{x + e(t)y} \right] \\ & + \theta_2 \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2} \left[-a_2(t) + \frac{c_2(t)x}{x + e(t)y} - b_2(t)y \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Then, from $\theta_i \in (0, 1]$ and from $\varsigma_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ($i = 1, 2$), there exists $K_1 = K_1(\theta_1, \theta_2, \varsigma_1, \varsigma_2)$ such that $LV_1(x, y) + V_1(x, y) \leq K_1$ for all $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{+0}$. Applying Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} d[e^t V_1(x_t, y_t)] = & e^t [V_1(x_t, y_t) + LV_1(x_t, y_t)] dt \\ & + e^t [\theta_1 \varsigma_1 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x_t) x_t^{\theta_1} + \theta_2 \varsigma_2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2 y_t) y_t^{\theta_2}] dw_t \\ \leq & K_1 e^t dt + e^t [\theta_1 \varsigma_1 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x_t) x_t^{\theta_1} + \theta_2 \varsigma_2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2 y_t) y_t^{\theta_2}] dw_t. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Using the sequence of stopping times $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ defined in the proof of Theorem 2.1 and from (3.9), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{t \wedge \tau_k} V_1(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k})] \leq V_1(x_0, y_0) + K_1 (\mathbb{E} e^{t \wedge \tau_k} - 1) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the latter inequality with a fact that $V(x_{t \wedge \tau_k}, y_{t \wedge \tau_k}) > 0$ and $0 < e^{t \wedge \tau_k} \leq e^t$ a.s., and using Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$e^t \mathbb{E} V_1(x_t, y_t) \leq V_1(x_0, y_0) + K_1 (e^t - 1).$$

Therefore, $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} V_1(x_t, y_t) \leq K_1$.

To prove Part (ii), we consider a function $V_2(x, y) = \varsigma_1 x^{\varrho_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\varrho_2}$. Since $\varrho_i \in [0, 3)$, there exist $\theta_i \in (0, 1)$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that $0 \leq \varrho_i < 2 + \theta_i$. Then, from (3.8) there exists $K_2 = K_2(\varrho_i, \varsigma_i)$ such that $LV_1(x, y) + V_2(x, y) \leq K_2$ for all $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{+0}$. Using (3.7) gives

$$V_1(x_t, y_t) \leq V_1(x_0, y_0) + \int_0^t [K_2 - V_2(x_s, y_s)] ds$$

$$+ \int_0^t [\theta_1 \varsigma_1 (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x_s) x_s^{\theta_1} + \theta_2 \varsigma_2 (\rho_1 + \rho_2 y_s) y_s^{\theta_2}] dw_s.$$

Taking expectations of both sides, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}V_1(x_t, y_t) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}V_2(x_s, y_s) ds \leq V_1(x_0, y_0) + K_2 t,$$

from which follows $\int_0^t \mathbb{E}V_2(x_s, y_s) ds \leq V_1(x_0, y_0) + K_2 t$. Therefore,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[\varsigma_1 x_s^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\theta_2}] ds \leq K_2.$$

□

4. UPPER GROWTH RATE ESTIMATION

In this section, we shall show the upper-growth rates of population under the case of the random factor making the effect only on the growth rate of population.

Theorem 4.1. *Under condition (H1), for any $\theta_i \geq 0$ and any initial value $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln [x_t^{\theta_1} y_t^{\theta_2}]}{\ln t} \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \quad a.s.$$

Furthermore, if $\theta_i \in [0, 1)$ then for any $\varsigma_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2$) there exists $K = K(\theta_i, \varsigma_i)$ such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (\varsigma_1 x_s^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\theta_2}) ds \leq K \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Firstly, we prove the first inequality. Putting $x_t = \exp\{\xi_t\}$, $y_t = \exp\{\eta_t\}$, $\vartheta_1 = a_1 - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2}$, $\vartheta_2 = a_2 + \frac{\rho_1^2}{2}$ and substituting this transformation into system (1.3), we obtain

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_t = \left[\vartheta_1 - b_1 \exp\{\xi_t\} - \frac{c_1 \exp\{\eta_t\}}{\exp\{\xi_t\} + e \exp\{\eta_t\}} \right] dt + \sigma_1 dw_t, \\ d\eta_t = \left[-\vartheta_2 - b_2 \exp\{\eta_t\} + \frac{c_2 \exp\{\xi_t\}}{\exp\{\xi_t\} + e \exp\{\eta_t\}} \right] dt + \rho_1 dw_t, \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{cases} d\xi_t = \left[\vartheta_1 - b_1 x_t - \frac{c_1 y_t}{x_t + e y_t} \right] dt + \sigma_1 dw_t, \\ d\eta_t = \left[-\vartheta_2 - b_2 y_t + \frac{c_2 x_t}{x_t + e y_t} \right] dt + \rho_1 dw_t. \end{cases}$$

Fix $p > 0$. Applying Itô's formula to $\exp\{pt\}\xi_t$ and $\exp\{pt\}\eta_t$, from (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{pt\}\xi_t &= \xi_0 + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[\vartheta_1 - b_1 x_s - \frac{c_1 y_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t p \exp\{ps\} \xi_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_1 \exp\{ps\} dw_s, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{pt\}\eta_t &= \eta_0 + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[-\vartheta_2 - b_2 y_s + \frac{c_2 x_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t p \exp\{ps\} \eta_s ds + \int_0^t \rho_1 \exp\{ps\} dw_s. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

We set

$$M_{1t} = \int_0^t \sigma_1 \exp\{ps\} dw_s, M_{2t} = \int_0^t \rho_1 \exp\{ps\} dw_s,$$

then M_{it} ($i = 1, 2$) are real valued continuous martingales vanishing at $t = 0$ with quadratic forms

$$\langle M_1, M_1 \rangle_t = \int_0^t \sigma_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds, \quad \langle M_2, M_2 \rangle_t = \int_0^t \rho_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > 1$. Using the exponential martingale inequality [6, Theorem 1.7.4], for every $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq k} \left[M_{it} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \langle M_i, M_i \rangle_t \geq \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \right] \right\} \leq \frac{1}{k^\theta}.$$

It then follows from Borel-Cantelli lemma that there exists an $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_i) = 1$ having the following property. For any $\omega \in \Omega_i$, there exists $k_i = k_i(\omega)$ such that, for all $k \geq k_i$ and $t \in [0, k]$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{1t} &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \langle M_1, M_1 \rangle_t + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \int_0^t \sigma_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k, \\ M_{2t} &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \langle M_2, M_2 \rangle_t + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \int_0^t \rho_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have from (4.2) and (4.3) that for any $\omega \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ and $t \in [0, k]$, $k \geq k_0(\omega)$, where $k_0(\omega) = k_1(\omega) \wedge k_2(\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{pt\} \xi_t &\leq \xi_0 + \int_0^t p \exp\{ps\} \xi_s ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[\vartheta_1 - b_1 x_s - \frac{c_1 y_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \int_0^t \sigma_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\ &= \xi_0 + p \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \xi_s ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[a_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - b_1 x_s + \frac{\varepsilon \sigma_1^2}{2} \exp\{-p(k-s)\} - \frac{c_1 y_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\{pt\} \eta_t &\leq \eta_0 + \int_0^t p \exp\{ps\} \eta_s ds, \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[-\vartheta_2 - b_2 y_s - \frac{c_2 x_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \exp\{-pk\} \int_0^t \rho_1^2 \exp\{2ps\} ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \eta_0 + p \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \eta_s ds + \frac{\theta \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[-\vartheta_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_2 y_s + \frac{\varepsilon \rho_1^2}{2} \exp\{-p(k-s)\} + \frac{c_2 x_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

From (4.4) and (4.5), for any $\omega \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ and $t \in [0, k], k \geq k_0(\omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\{pt\}(\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t) &\leq (\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[p(\theta_1 \xi_s + \theta_2 \eta_s) + \theta_1 \vartheta_1 - \theta_2 \vartheta_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\varepsilon [\theta_1 \sigma_1^2 + \theta_2 \rho_1^2]}{2} \exp\{-p(k-s)\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_1 \theta_1 x_s - b_2 \theta_2 y_s + \frac{\theta_2 c_2 x_s - \theta_1 c_1 y_s}{x_s + e y_s} \right] ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists $H = H(p, \theta_1, \theta_2) > 0$ such that for any $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{+0}$,

$$\left[p(\theta_1 \ln x + \theta_2 \ln y) + \theta_1 \vartheta_1 - \theta_2 \vartheta_2 - b_1 \theta_1 x - b_2 \theta_2 y + \frac{\theta_2 c_2 x - \theta_1 c_1 y}{x + e y} \right] \leq H.$$

It then follows from (4.6) that for any $\omega \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$ and $t \in [0, k], k \geq k_0(\omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp\{pt\}(\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t) &\leq (\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\
&\quad + \int_0^t \exp\{ps\} \left[H + \frac{\varepsilon(\theta_1 \sigma_1^2 + \theta_2 \rho_1^2)}{2} \right] ds \\
&\leq (\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{pk\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p} \left[H + \frac{\varepsilon(\theta_1 \sigma_1^{u^2} + \theta_2 \rho_1^{u^2})}{2} \right] (\exp\{pt\} - 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t &\leq (\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) \exp\{-pt\} + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{p(k-t)\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p} \left[H + \frac{\varepsilon(\theta_1 \sigma_1^{u^2} + \theta_2 \rho_1^{u^2})}{2} \right] (1 - \exp\{-pt\}) \\
&\leq (\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{p(k-t)\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p} \left[H + \frac{\varepsilon(\theta_1 \sigma_1^{u^2} + \theta_2 \rho_1^{u^2})}{2} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

For any $\omega \in \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2$, $k \geq k_0(\omega)$ and $t \in [k-1, k]$, from (4.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t}{\ln t} &\leq \frac{1}{\ln(k-1)} \left[(\theta_1 \xi_0 + \theta_2 \eta_0) + \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{p\}}{\varepsilon} \ln k \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{p} \left\{ H + \frac{\varepsilon(\theta_1 \sigma_1^{u^2} + \theta_2 \rho_1^{u^2})}{2} \right\} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

from which implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t}{\ln t} \leq \frac{\theta(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \exp\{p\}}{\varepsilon}.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 1^-$, $\theta \rightarrow 1^+$, $p \rightarrow 0^+$ and noting $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2) = 1$ yields

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\theta_1 \xi_t + \theta_2 \eta_t}{\ln t} \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

i.e.,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln [x_t^{\theta_1} y_t^{\theta_2}]}{\ln t} \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Now, we prove the remain inequality. Putting $V(x, y) = \ln(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})$ and using Itô's formula, we get easily that

$$\begin{aligned} dV(x_t, y_t) &= \left[\frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 x^{\theta_1}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} \left(a_1 - b_1 x - \frac{c_1 y}{x + ey} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{\varsigma_2 \theta_2 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} \left(-a_2 - b_2 y + \frac{c_2 x}{x + ey} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{[\varsigma_1 \theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1) x^{\theta_1} (\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}) - \varsigma_1^2 \theta_1^2 x^{2\theta_1}] \sigma_1}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{[\varsigma_2 \theta_2 (\theta_2 - 1) y^{\theta_2} (\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}) - \varsigma_2^2 \theta_2^2 y^{2\theta_2}] \rho_1}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2} \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\varsigma_1 \varsigma_2 \theta_1 \theta_2 \sigma_1 \rho_1 x^{\theta_1} y^{\theta_2}}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2} \right] dt \\ &\quad + \frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 \sigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 \theta_2 \rho_1 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} dw_t \\ &= P(x, y, t) dt + \frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 \sigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 \theta_2 \rho_1 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} dw_t, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P(x, y, t) &= \frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 x^{\theta_1}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} \left(a_1 - b_1 x - \frac{c_1 y}{x + ey} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varsigma_2 \theta_2 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} \left(-a_2 - b_2 y + \frac{c_2 x}{x + ey} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 \sigma_1 [\varsigma_2 (\theta_1 - 1) y^{\theta_2} - \varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1}] x^{\theta_1}}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varsigma_2 \theta_2 \rho_1 [\varsigma_1 (\theta_2 - 1) x^{\theta_1} - \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}] y^{\theta_2}}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\varsigma_1 \varsigma_2 \theta_1 \theta_2 \sigma_1 \rho_1 x^{\theta_1} y^{\theta_2}}{2(\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Putting

$$K = \sup_{(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+} [P(x, y, t) + (\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2})]$$

and

$$M_t = \int_0^t \frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 \sigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 \theta_2 \rho_1 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} dw_s,$$

then $\{M_t, \mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a martingale, and by $\theta_i \in [0, 1)$, we see that $K < \infty$. The quadratic variation of M_t can be shown by using [6, Theorem 5.14, p.25] as follows.

$$\langle M, M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \left[\frac{\varsigma_1 \theta_1 \sigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 \theta_2 \rho_1 y^{\theta_2}}{\varsigma_1 x^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y^{\theta_2}} \right]^2 ds.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle M, M \rangle_t}{t} \leq [\max\{\theta_1 \sigma_1^u, \theta_2 \sigma_2^u\}]^2.$$

So, using the strong law of large numbers for martingale [6, Theorem 1.3.4], we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_t}{t} = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (4.9)$$

On the other hand, from (4.8), we have

$$0 < V(x_t, y_t) \leq \int_0^t [K - (\varsigma_1 x_s^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\theta_2})] ds + M_t,$$

from which follows

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (\varsigma_1 x_s^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\theta_2}) ds \leq K + \frac{M_t}{t}.$$

Therefore, by (4.9),

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t (\varsigma_1 x_s^{\theta_1} + \varsigma_2 y_s^{\theta_2}) ds \leq K \quad \text{a.s.}$$

□

Remark 4.2. For the deterministic version of model (1.3), i.e., $\sigma_i = \rho_i = 0$ and the other coefficients are constants, it is easy to see that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_t = 0$ holds under some special conditions, i.e., the predator dies out, but it never get $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t = 0$ (if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_t = 0$ then $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t \geq \frac{a_1}{b_1} > 0$). However, in the above theorem, if $K = 0$ then both prey and predator die out. This means that a relatively large stochastic perturbation can cause the extinction of the population. Further, the prey population dies out even if there is no predator and the death rate is so rapid (at an exponential rate). We can see that in two following theorems.

Theorem 4.3. Under condition (H1), if the prey is absent, i.e., $x_t = 0$ a.s. for all $t \geq 0$, then the predator dies with probability one. Furthermore, the death rate of predator is exponential, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln y_t}{t} \leq -\inf_{t \geq 0} \left[a_2(t) + \frac{\rho_1^2(t)}{2} \right] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. The quantity $y_t = \exp\{\eta_t\}$ of predator at the time t satisfies the following equation

$$d\eta_t = \left[-a_2 - \frac{\rho_1^2}{2} - b_2 \exp\{\eta_t\} \right] dt + \rho_1 dw_t.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_t &= \eta_0 + \int_0^t \left[-a_2 - \frac{\rho_1^2}{2} - b_2 \exp\{\eta_s\} \right] ds + M_t \\ &\leq \eta_0 - \inf_{t \geq 0} \left[a_2(t) + \frac{\rho_1^2(t)}{2} \right] t + M_t, \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where $M_t = \int_0^t \rho_1(s) dw_s$ is a martingale. The quadratic variation of M_t

$$\langle M, M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \rho_1^2(s) ds$$

satisfying

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle M, M \rangle_t}{t} \leq \rho_1^2.$$

Using the strong law of large numbers for martingales gives $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_t}{t} = 0$ a.s. It then follows from (4.10) that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln y_t}{t} \leq -\inf_{t \geq 0} \left[a_2(t) + \frac{\rho_1^2(t)}{2} \right]$$

and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_t = 0$ a.s. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Under condition (H1), if the predator is absent, i.e., $y_t = 0$ a.s. for all $t \geq 0$, then the quantity of prey satisfies the following*

- (i) *If $\sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ a_1(t) - \frac{\sigma_1^2(t)}{2} \right\} < 0$ then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t = 0$ a.s. and the prey dies out at an exponential rate;*
- (ii) *If $\sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ a_1(t) - \frac{\sigma_1^2(t)}{2} \right\} = 0$ then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}x_t = 0$;*
- (iii)

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln x_t}{\ln t} \leq 1 \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Similarly to Theorem 4.3, the quantity $x_t = \exp\{\xi_t\}$ of prey at time t satisfies the following equation

$$d\xi_t = \left[a_1 - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2} - b_1 \exp\{\xi_t\} \right] dt + \sigma_1 dw_t.$$

For Case (i), we have

$$d\xi_t \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ a_1(t) - \frac{\sigma_1^2(t)}{2} \right\} dt + \sigma_1 dw_t.$$

Using the same arguments as in Theorem 4.3 yields

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln x_t}{t} \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ a_1(t) - \frac{\sigma_1^2(t)}{2} \right\} < 0,$$

from which follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_t = 0$ a.s. and the death rate of prey is exponential. Consider Case (ii). It follows from

$$\xi_t = \xi_0 + \int_0^t \left[a_1 - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2} - b_1 \exp\{\xi_s\} \right] ds + \int_0^t \sigma_1(s) dw_s,$$

and Jensen's inequality that

$$\mathbb{E}\xi_t \leq \xi_0 - b_1^l \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \exp\{\xi_s\} ds \leq \xi_0 - b_1^l \int_0^t \exp\{\mathbb{E}\xi_s\} ds.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}\xi_t \leq Z_t$ where Z_t is the solution of the following differential equation

$$Z_t' = -b_1^l \exp\{Z_t\}, \quad Z_0 = \xi_0.$$

It is easy to see that $Z_t = -\log[b_1^l t + \exp\{-\xi_0\}] \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\xi_t = -\infty$. Using Jensen inequality again gives $\mathbb{E}x_t = 0$. The proof of Case (iii) is similar to one of Theorem 4.1. We therefore omit it here.

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee(s) for his very helpful suggestions which greatly improve the manuscript. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Arnold, L.; *Stochastic Differential Equations: Theory and Applications*, Wiley, New York, 1972.
- [2] Arnold, L., Horsthemke, W., Stucki, J. W.; *The influence of external real and white noise on the Lotka-Volterra model*, Biom. Journal, 21(1979), 451- 471.
- [3] Arditi, R., Ginzburg, L. R.; *Coupling in predator-prey dynamics: ratio-dependence*, J. Theoret. Biol., 139(1989), 311-326.
- [4] Friedman, A.; *Stochastic Differential Equations and their Applications*, Academic press, New York, 1976.
- [5] Karatzat, I., Shreve, S. E.; *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [6] Mao, X.; *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*, Horwood, 1997.
- [7] Mao, X., Marion, G., Renshaw, E.; *Environmental Brownian noise suppresses explosions in population dynamics*, Stochastic Process. Appl., 97(2002), 95-110.
- [8] Mao, X., Sabanis, S., Renshaw, E.; *Asymptotic behaviour of the stochastic Lotka-Volterra model*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 287(2003), 141-156.
- [9] Skalski, G. T., Gilliam, J. F.; *Functional responses with predator interference: viable alternatives to the Holling type II model*, Ecology, 82(2001), 3083-3092.
- [10] Ta, V. T.; *Dynamics of species in a non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra system*, Acta Math. Acad. Paedagog. Nyhazi., 25(2009), 45-54.

NGUYEN THI HOAI LINH

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, OSAKA 565-0871

TA VIET TON

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED PHYSICS, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, SUITA, OSAKA 565-0871, JAPAN

E-mail address: `tavieta.ton[at]ap.eng.osaka-u.ac.jp`